

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The examiner objected to the specification for not including headings. Amendments to the specification adding headings are included in this response, making this objection moot.

The examiner objected to claims 4, 5, & 6 because of informalities. However, applicant believes that the Examiner intended to object to claims 5, 6 & 7. Those claims have been amended to address the Examiner's objections, making the objections moot.

Claim 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rahim (EP 0 881 625 A2). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of "selecting and executing a suitable process from a plurality of available processes based on the identified momentary acoustic scene" (lines 11-13). Rahim does not suggest a plurality of processes and choosing one based on an identified momentary acoustic scene. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the reference.

Claims 2-8, which depend on claim 1, directly or indirectly, are thus patentable over the reference for the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the limitations contained therein.

New claims 19-25 are patentable over the reference for the same reasons discussed above, as well as for the limitations contained therein. In particular, claim 19 recites the step of "executing said selected suitable process to generate a processed *acoustic* signal", which is not taught by the reference. Further, claim 23 recites the step of "processing said acoustic signal to generate a hearing signal for improving the hearing ability of a user" and claim 25 recites that said suitable process is "chosen from a plurality of available processes for improving the hearing ability of a user", neither of which are suggested by the reference. Similarly, claims 20 and 25 recite the step of "analyzing the acoustic structure of the acoustic signal for identifying tonal signals in acoustical signals generated by speech and tonal signals generated by music". The reference does not suggest identifying tonal signals in acoustical

signals generated by music. In addition, claims 24 and 25 recite the step of "generating an audio signal from said processed acoustic signal for transmission to" a user, which is not suggested by the reference.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33234.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

June 20, 2003